

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, at least at page 14, line 23, *et seq.* No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshida (U.S. 6,178,005), in view of alleged Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), and Miyata et al. (U.S. 4,825,250).

Claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshida (U.S. 6,178,005), in view of alleged Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), Miyata et al. (U.S. 4,825,250), and Dow et al., (U.S. 6,784,904).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 relates to a method of reading a plurality of film originals. The film originals are mounted with a slide mount, placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus, and displayed on a monitor unit of a computer connected to the image reading apparatus. As amended, the method includes an image reading step of reading each of the images of the originals placed on the original support, identifying a number of frames of film originals present on the original support, and cutting out image areas of frames of the film originals to generate image signals. The method also includes a placement orientation detection step of detecting placement orientation of the original as to whether it is landscape or portrait, based on lengths in horizontal and vertical directions of the image signal generated in the image reading step, an image signal rotation step of rotating the image signal to be in a landscape

placement, when the placement orientation of the original detected in the placement orientation detection step is different from the landscape placement, and a read image signal display step of displaying the plurality of read image signals on one display screen of the monitor unit in the landscape placement and in a form of a thumbnail type display.

Yoshida relates to an image processing apparatus that controls a blank to be a predetermined length in accordance with the size of the recording medium. Yoshida discloses a reading circuit 10, formed of imaging elements, and an optical system which sequentially reads image signals from one line in a main scanning direction from a manuscript to be transmitted. The information is sequenced into binary values and sent from a signal line 10a to a coding circuit 12 (column 3, lines 27-34).

The Office Action, relying on the Related Background Art section of the specification (specifically page 1, line 5 - page 2, line 26), alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Yoshida's teaching to include 1) reading a plurality of film originals mounted with a slide mount, and 2) displaying them on a monitor.

Miyata et al., relates to an image forming apparatus in which, depending upon a user instruction, a plurality of images may be formed into a composite image on a recording medium. In this regard, Miyata et al., discloses a trimming operation in which a user manually inputs image coordinates of a desired portion of an original document, thus identifying a first image region. (column 10, line 64, Figure 1). After identifying a first image region, the entire original document is exposed, via a slit, by an exposure lamp 40 so that an electrostatic image is formed on the drum 1 (column 3, line 45 - column 4, line 15). Then a non-scan exposure lamp 60 erases surface charges on the drum 1, corresponding to a non-image region. The resultant

latent image on the drum 1 is transferred to a recording medium, and the drum 1 is subsequently cleaned. The recording medium proceeds to a middle tray 59 for temporary storage, while the above described image formation process is repeated for a second image region. The recording medium is then recalled from the middle tray 59, and registration roller 15 is controlled so that a second image region is transferred from the drum 1 to a desired location on the recording medium.

In Miyata et al., the trimming function erases unnecessary image portions of the images, and a masking portion prevents shaded portions from being recorded. The Office Action relies on Miyata et al. for a teach of cutting an image area of an original to generate the image signal.

In contrast to Applicant's Claim 1, however, Miyata et al., neither teaches nor suggest, among other features, an image reading step that includes identifying a number of frames of film originals present on the original support, and cutting out image areas of frames of the film originals to generate image signals. Accordingly, Miyata et al., fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoshida and the alleged AAPA, with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 15 relates to a system for reading a plurality of film originals and corresponds to Claim 1. Claim 15, therefore, is submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Yoshida, the alleged AAPA, and Miyata et al., even if proper, fails to teach or suggest features of Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 15, and thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the patent to Dow et al., is directed to an appliance and method for navigating among multiple captured images and functional menus. Applicant submits, however, that Dow et al., fails to remedy the deficiencies noted above with regard to Claim 1, and thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 15 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent claims 2-6 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. Due consideration and prompt passage to issuance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SMW:ayr

FCHS_WS 2767585v1